

REMARKS

After entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 1-21 remain pending in the application, unchanged. Reconsideration is requested.

The specification has been updated to include references to application and patent numbers that were not available when the specification was originally filed.

The Section 112 rejections are not understood; the cited language is believed clear to an artisan.

As to antecedent basis, the “withstanding at least certain photocopying operations” is used to distinguish the claimed “second digital watermark” from so-called “frail” or “fragile” watermarks. As noted in the specification at page 2, lines 4-7, a fragile watermark is “one designed, e.g., not to fully withstand the scanning/printing operations associated with photocopying...” See also page 6, lines 14-15, and the documents incorporated by reference on page 6.

“...linking to an internet computer site” finds support in the specification, e.g., at page 2, lines 20-22; page 3, lines 22-25; and page 10, lines 11-13. Additional support for this limitation is found in application 09/571,422 that is cited at page 10, line 11, and incorporated by reference through language found at page 15, lines 7-9.

“...representing a device or user that produced the document” finds support in the specification, e.g., at page 1, lines 23-26; page 3, lines 11-12; page 5, lines 3-5 and 10-15; and page 12, line 20.

The rejection of claims 1, 8-10 and 12-14 as anticipated by Gilham (4,394,846) is respectfully traversed. Among other shortcomings, Gilham does not disclose a fragile digital watermark, as required by each of the cited claims. Instead, he appears to employ a bar code.

Moreover, while the Examiner has asserted that Gilham teaches a method of “franking mail items with bits of data that are ... distinguishable from a photocopy...,” the undersigned finds no such photocopy-related teaching in the reference.

In view of the cited shortcoming, other limitations supporting patentability of claims 1, 8-10 and 12-14 are not belabored.

The sentence rejecting claims 2-4, 6, 7, 15-17, 19 and 21 does so over Bloom (6,332,194) alone. However, Bloom does not appear to contain any teaching or suggestion concerning postage.

The text explaining the rejection makes reference to Gilham. But to the extent a rejection was intended over Gilham+Bloom, that combination is deficient, e.g., for the reasons set forth above in connection with the anticipation rejection.

Likewise, the sentence rejecting claims 5 and 18 does so over Moskowitz (5,822,432) alone. And the sentence rejecting claims 11 and 20 does so over Daigneault (6,334,678) alone. Again, however, neither Moskowitz nor Daigneault appears to contain any teaching or suggestion concerning postage.

Again, the text explaining the rejections makes reference to Gilham. Again, to the extent rejections were intended over Gilham+Moskowitz and Gilham + Daigneault, such combinations are deficient, e.g., for the reasons set forth above in connection with the anticipation rejection.

Most of the patent applications filed by the present assignee concerning digital watermarking have been assigned to Group Art Unit 2621, and many of those have been examined by Examiners Andrew Johns (703-305-4788) and Jose Couso (703-305-4774). Those Examiners may be able to assist the present examiner concerning the watermark-related aspects of the currently-claimed combinations.

In view of the foregoing, a notice of allowance is solicited.

Date: June 13, 2003



23735

Phone: 503-885-9699
FAX 503-885-9880

Respectfully submitted,

DIGIMARC CORPORATION

By


William Y. Conwell
Registration No. 31,943